

Remarks

Claims 1-14 are pending, and claims 1-14 stand rejected. Claims 1-8 have been amended, and claims 9-14 have been cancelled. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections as follows.

Double Patenting Rejection

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1-14 on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting over claims 1-27 of co-pending application 10/696,953. The Applicants have filed a terminal disclaimer herewith to overcome the double patenting rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 7-8 as being indefinite by reciting limitations lacking antecedent basis in independent base claim 1. The Applicants have amended claim 1 to fix the lack of antecedent basis in claims 5 and 7-8.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-14 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicants have cancelled claims 13-14.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,603,478 (Kuo) in view of U.S. Patent 5,533,174 (Flowers). The Applicants submit that claims 1-8 are non-obvious in view of the cited art.

Typically a client computer in a printing system will generate a data stream that contains page description information used to print a document. The page description information will also include references to fixed font resources (e.g., a TrueType font) from a resource library used to present a set of characters in that font. After the data stream is generated by the client and sent for printing, it may be desirable to change the fonts assigned to the set of characters in the data stream without re-generating the data stream. For example, on a large print job involving printing thousands of bills, a user may wish to change the font type used in printing the job without re-generating the print job. Because the original data stream generated by the client

includes fixed references to font resources, this would not be possible.

Independent claim 1 in the pending application is a system which uses a table to map the native names of fonts installed on the client to fonts in a resource library. A print server has the ability to modify the resource table and provide a means for altering the final font output of the print job by updating the font mapping in the resource table after the print job has been generated and sent to a print server.

With regard to claim 1, the Applicants submit that neither Kuo nor Flowers teaches or reasonably suggests that a print server can receive a data stream containing device-independent (native names) font names, process the data stream using a table to map the device-independent font names to a first font resource to generate a second data stream for printing, and then re-process the first data stream using the table to map the device-independent font names to a second font resource to generate a third data stream for printing. For example, the system described in claim 1 allows a client, using a font mapping table which maps native names of installed fonts on the client to font resources in a resource library, to generate a data stream using the table and send the data stream to a print server. The print server may then modify the mapping table, for example, to map new font resources to native names. The first data stream is then re-processed using the new font mapping table to generate a new output data stream. This allows a print job to be generated on a client, sent to a print server, and then re-processed by the print server using a new mapping table to change fonts without re-generating the original print job.

Kuo describes an application on a client computer having access to a portion of an Asian font. In Kuo, if a user requests a font that is not available on the local computer, then a request message is generated and sent to a remote computer that stores another portion of the Asian font. If the character requested is located on the remote computer, the character is returned to the client computer for display. Kuo does not teach or reasonably suggest a print server operable for receiving this request message, processing the request message against a font mapping table to map native names of fonts to fonts in a resource library, or reprocessing the original request message to print the job using a modified font mapping table.

Flowers discusses a font server that communicates with printers and workstations (clients), and provides them with font-specific information in a format which is compatible with both. Flowers further discusses that the font server and clients includes a name-identifier table.

The clients assign name-identifiers to structured names (fonts) in the table to allow the clients and the font server to communicate using the shorter name-identifier instead of the longer structured name (font). If a client wishes to communicate with a font server, it sends the mapping table to the font server to allow the client and the font server to each know the correct mapping required to translate the name-identifiers in the communication to the font names on the font server. In Flowers, the client generates a data stream using the name-identifier table and sends it to the font server. The font server processes the received data stream using the name-identifier table and generates a data stream for output. The Applicants submit that Flowers is not operable to process within a print server a previously generated data stream from the client using a new mapping table to generate a new data stream for output based on the mapping of the original name-identifiers to new fonts. Applicants therefore submit that Flowers does not teach or reasonably suggest this limitation as in claim 1 of the pending application, and thus, claim 1 is novel and non-obvious over the cited art.

As neither Kuo nor Flowers teaches this limitation of claim 1 in the pending application, neither does the combination of Kuo or Flowers teaches this limitation.

Dependent claims 2-8, which depend on amended independent claim 1, are novel and non-obvious for similar reasons provided above.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-8 are novel and non-obvious over the combination of Flowers and Kuo, and respectfully ask the Examiner to allow claims 1-8.

The Applicants have hereby petitioned for a one month extension of time for this reply and have submitted the required fees therefore as well as fees for the Terminal Disclaimer filed herewith. The Applicants believe no other fees are due in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 22 January 2008

/Daniel N. Fishman/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Daniel N. Fishman, Reg. No. 35,512

Duft Bornson & Fishman, LLP

Telephone: (303) 786-7687

Faxsimile: (303) 786-7691